

§ 794.101

workweek at a rate not less than one and one-half times the minimum wage applicable to him under section 6, and if such employee receives compensation for employment in excess of 12 hours in any workday, or for employment in excess of 56 hours in any workweek, as the case may be, at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

§ 794.101 Intended scope of exemption.

Under section 7(b)(3) of the Act, the intent of the exemption must be given effect in determining the scope of its application to an enterprise and to the employees of an enterprise. The statutory language must be applied to the facts in a manner consistent with the purpose of the exemption as evidenced by its legislative history. This purpose is to relieve the described enterprises from the application of the Act's general overtime pay requirements (in the limited manner specified in the exemption) to employment in their activities of distributing petroleum products. Such employment was stated to be affected by climatic, seasonal, and other pertinent factors characteristic of business operations in the distribution of such products. (See, in this connection, the following documents of 87th Cong., first sess.: H. Rept. No. 75, pp. 26, 27, 36; 105 Congressional Record (daily edition) p. 4519; S. Rept. No. 145, pp. 37, 50; H. Rept. No. 327, p. 18; Hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Labor on S. 256, S. 879, and S. 895, at pp. 411-424; Hearings before House Special Subcommittee on Labor on H.R. 2935, at pp. 422-425 and 627-629; and these documents of the 89th Cong., second sess.: H. Rept. No. 1366, pp. 12, 13, and 43; Cong. Record (daily edition) p. 10745; S. Rept. No. 1487, pp. 32 and 51.)

§ 794.102 Guides for construing exemptions.

It is judicially settled that "The details with which the exemptions in this Act have been made preclude their enlargement by implication" and "no matter how broad the exemption, it is meant to apply only to" the employment specified in the statute. Conditions specified in the language of the Act are "explicit prerequisites to exemption." Accordingly, it is the well-established rule that exemptions from the Act "are to be narrowly construed

29 CFR Ch. V (7-1-14 Edition)

against the employer seeking to assert them" and their applications is limited to those who come "plainly and unmistakably within their terms and spirit." An employer who claims such an exemption has the burden of showing that it applies. See *Wirtz v. Lunsford*, 404 F. 2d 693 (C.A. 6); *Addison v. Holly Hill*, 322 U.S. 607; *Maneja v. Waialua*, 349 U.S. 254; *Phillips v. Walling*, 334 U.S. 490; *Arnold v. Kanowsky*, 361 U.S. 388; *Mitchell v. Kentucky Finance Co.*, 359 U.S. 290; *Walling v. General Industries Co.*, 330 U.S. 545.

§ 794.103 Dependence of exemption on engagement in described distribution.

By its terms, section 7(b)(3) provides a partial and contingent exemption from the general overtime pay requirements of the Act applicable to "any employee * * * employed * * * by an * * * enterprise * * * engaged in the wholesale or bulk distribution of petroleum product * * *." Thus, engagement in the described distribution is an "explicit prerequisite to exemption" (*Arnold v. Kanowsky*, 361 U.S. 388), as are the other express conditions set forth in the section. A natural reading of the statutory language suggests that the employee as well as the enterprise must be so engaged in order for the exemption to apply (see *Porto Rico Light Co. v. Mor*, 253 U.S. 345). To the extent that its employees are engaged in the described distribution, the enterprise is itself so engaged (see *Kirshbaum v. Walling*, 316 U.S. 517; and see § 794.104). Also, whenever an enterprise is so engaged, any of its employees will be considered to be "employed by an * * * enterprise * * * engaged in the wholesale or bulk distribution of petroleum products" if the duties of his employment require him to perform any operations or provide any services in carrying on such activities of his employer, and if the employee is not engaged in a substantial portion of his workweek in other activities which do not provide a basis for exemption under section 7(b)(3). Such an interpretation of the quoted language is believed necessary to give effect to the intended scope of the exemption as explained in § 794.101.